



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL

CONTINUING "THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER"

MARCH 1917

EDUCATIONAL NEWS AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

The Department of Superintendence had a large and enthusiastic meeting at Kansas City. The program as announced was carried out without serious omissions of any kind. The **Meeting of the Department of Superintendence** international situation which existed during the period of the meeting led the Department to abandon its usual practice of passing general resolutions on school matters. The whole report of the Resolutions Committee consisted of a brief resolution, which was adopted unanimously and by a standing vote, expressing the complete confidence of the Department in the President of the United States and its loyalty to his policies in dealing with the international situation.

It was voted that the next meeting shall be held in Atlanta, Georgia, under the presidency of Thomas E. Finegan, assistant commissioner of education in the state of New York.

Prior to the business meeting the Department listened to an elaborate report presented by Superintendent Chadsey, of Detroit. This report was in the hands of the members in printed form, and dealt with the relation of superintendents to boards of education. The importance of this matter justifies our devoting a great deal of space to the general principles adopted by the Department of Superintendence. The principles were unanimously adopted and are given in detail below. At the same time, three committees

were created, one to distribute these principles and to draw them to the attention of boards of education, a second to work out the details of the necessary rules and legislation which will put these principles into operation, and a third to secure the co-operation of boards of education in defining the administrative relations here under discussion. The general principles adopted are as follows:

1. The representatives of the people who are in charge of educational systems should realize that they represent, not the local interests of a narrow district, but the interests of the whole community. Education cannot be complete or its equipment satisfactory unless localities of very different character are brought into co-operation. Education is a function of the state, not of single communities.

This principle is based on the consideration that population in its readjustments brings constantly into one district people who were shortly before in other districts. Furthermore, the higher forms of education can be supported only by large units of population. Thus the high-school district must be large, and this is still more evident in the case of the state institutions, such as normal schools and state universities.

Local school officers often forget that education is the duty of the state. They conceive themselves to be guardians of a narrow district. They seek the advantage of a certain section of the town, or they represent the special interest of some one class in the community.

The board of education which conceives its duty in a large way will not aim to secure in its membership personal representatives of all classes in the community, but will strive to represent the whole system by making adequate studies of the interests of all classes. For example, it is not possible to include in the board personal representatives of every ward or of all the trades and professions, but the board should study the needs of all wards and of all trades and professions.

The tendency in all school systems has been in the direction of a reduction in the number of members of the board. The old idea was a board made up of personal representatives of all interests. The better principle is that the board learns about all interests and represents all interests through intelligence rather than through partisan partiality and logrolling.

The realization of this principle appears in the fact that the majority of boards are today made up of persons who represent the school system at large, not by districts.

2. A second general principle issues directly from the first. The representatives of the broad community interests in education should be free from any local entanglements. The same persons should not be involved in a study of the educational needs of a town and in the study of other needs, such as police, fire equipment, etc., because these latter are more restricted interests

than is education. The educational system is in part paid for out of state funds and will from this time on be affected increasingly by national subsidies of particular activities. There will be the largest necessity for a high-minded consideration of the most advantageous disposition of all resources for the good of the state and of the whole community. This requires the divorcement of the school system from local politics, however legitimate the latter may be.

There is, accordingly, a strong tendency to separate the board of education from all branches of local government and to give it autonomy in all matters.

3. The representatives of the people cannot perform directly the large duties of carrying on the school system. They must employ technically trained officers to conduct the schools. To these technically trained officers they must look for proper information on which to base their decisions, and they must be prepared to intrust to those officers the powers and responsibilities which attach to the daily conduct of school work.

There is little doubt on the part of all communities that technical training is necessary for the proper conduct of schools, but the exact definition of the sphere within which technical training is needed is not yet worked out in most systems.

A series of concrete examples may therefore be offered as illustrating the type of duty which board members cannot properly perform. No board member should teach classes. No board member should act as principal of a school. No board member should negotiate with a publisher of textbooks, or should pass on the availability of a given book for use in a school. No board member should examine teachers with a view to determining their qualifications for appointment. No board member should plan a school building. No board member should write the course of study. Even where individual cases may arise in which particular members of certain boards would have the ability to perform these tasks, it is better that a well-established division of labor should be recognized. It is the duty of the members of the board to see that technical officers do the work of the system, but the board should not do this work itself. It is a public board, created to see that a certain piece of public work is done, not a group of technical officers created to do the work.

The safe analogy in this case is the analogy of the board of directors in a business corporation. No one can imagine a director of a railroad stopping a train and giving the engineer and the conductor orders about their duties. It ought to be possible to organize and define the technical duties of a school system, and to distinguish them from the broad duties which reside in the representatives of the people.

4. It is fundamental to the conduct of a school system to recognize that instruction is the end and aim of all that is undertaken. The buildings are erected with a view to the housing of instruction; all supplies are used for instruction; all officers in the system are appointed for the purpose of directing or conducting instruction. It follows that there should be no subordination

of instruction to business interests and no separation of the general management of the business concerns of the system from the general management of instruction.

It is sometimes held by board members that they know about business matters and do not know about instruction, and, on the other hand, it is freely asserted that school officers are inefficient in business matters. It is the judgment of the educational profession that board members cannot be intelligent about the conduct of schools unless they secure and thoroughly comprehend reports on the instructional phases of school work. It is equally the judgment of the profession that no supervisory officer of a school system is competent to manage the details of a school system if he cannot comprehend the business relations involved. In some large systems there must be a separation of personal duties between the general superintendent and the manager of business details, just as there must be assistant supervisors of instruction. In such cases it is a fundamental requirement of good organization that the instructional demands of the system shall be dominant, and that this fact shall be clearly recognized in the organization.

5. The financial duty of the board is to be described in the statement that the board should see to it that the funds of the system are collected and distributed in a thoroughly systematic fashion. This calls for a definite budget, a clear public financial statement, and a careful study of the principles underlying distribution, so that all the functions of the system may share equitably in the support which is available. If all these requirements are complied with, it may be, and often is, the duty of the board in the capacity of representatives of the public to make an appeal to the people for further support.

A series of new financial problems have of late arisen to complicate the duties of the board. There is a demand for social centers, for playgrounds, for night schools for adults, and for other activities which cost money and were not formerly a part of school expenditure. The board of education has to decide what share of the public-school money can properly be expended for these types of activity.

There is no problem in which the obligation of the board to the people whom they represent is more clearly exemplified than in this problem of organizing and distributing finances. It is a fundamental mistake for a board to assume that it is called upon to spend the funds of the system. It should organize expenditure and create the proper machinery for making the expenditure, but the board is not the spending agent.

6. The technical officers of the school system will be most harmonious in their activities if they are placed under the supervision of a single head or manager, who is the executive head of the system. This central supervisor should have the responsibilities and the rights which will make possible a compact organization of the working force in the schools.

7. The superintendent must be a man of superior training. He must be prepared to report plans of organization and to make a clear statement of

results. He should organize the officers under him in such a way as to secure from them in detail an efficient type of organization, and he should secure from them adequate reports on which to base the statements which he presents to the board.

8. In the performance of these functions the superintendent has a right to the initiative in technical matters. Specifically, he should have the sole right to perform the following: (a) recommend all teachers, all officers of supervision, and all janitors and clerks; (b) work out the course of study with the co-operation of the other officers of instruction; (c) select textbooks with the same co-operation; (d) have a determining voice in matters of building and equipment; and (e) draw up the annual budget.

These technical recommendations should always be reviewed by the board, and the approval of the board should be a necessary step for final enactment. This will insure the careful preparation of reports and the careful study of results. The superintendent is not to be authorized to conduct the system apart from the board, but he should be insured by definite forms of organization against interference which will defeat his plans and divide his responsibility.

Public business suffers when these technical matters are improperly handled. Let us assume two cases. In the first case the superintendent may be inefficient, and the board or some other active agency may cover up his inefficiency for a time by doing his work for him. The result will be disastrous in the end. It would be better for public business to bring the inefficiency to the surface as quickly as possible and remove the officer who cannot conduct the system properly. In the second case the superintendent is efficient, but is hampered by lack of definition of his functions. The school system will lack in unity of organization and in harmony of internal operation. The system will be defective in so far as it is divided against itself.

9. In the relations of the board to all officers of the system it is essential that appointment, reappointment, dismissal, and promotion be removed from the interference of petty personal influences, and that all such transactions be based on records which are systematically organized and supervised.

There is no clearer indication of the condition of a school system than the attitude of the teachers and other officers to their duties and to the results which they are securing. The school system which is well organized exhibits co-operation on the part of all its officers. The interests of the public suffer beyond measure when appointments are the result of illegitimate personal influences.

10. The demands of an educational system move forward each year with the progress of modern life. There is constant need of development in school policies. There is constant need of additional training on the part of all who participate in the work of the school system. School organization must explicitly provide for continuation training of its technical officers, and for systematic review of school policies by all who have to do with the school

system. The counterpart of this development of school policies is the preservation of those elements of organization which have proved to be effective. American school systems suffer from instability. The board changes and the superintendent and teachers are of short tenure. There should be a clear recognition of the fact that the training of novices is always expensive. The business world has learned that it often costs more to train a new clerk than to increase the salary of an experienced clerk. American school systems have been most uneconomical in the treatment of their organizations. There should be an effort to insure stability with accompanying progressiveness, a retention of that which is effective with a supplementing and strengthening of that which is weak.

At the request of the editors of the *Journal*, Mr. Lutz, of the Russell Sage Foundation, has prepared the following statement with regard to the Indianapolis meeting:

Meeting of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education The attendance at the annual convention of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education held in Indianapolis between February 20 and 24 was unusually large, owing in part to a very interesting program and in part to the fact that the convention took place during the week immediately preceding that of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Many eastern school men improved the opportunity to attend both conventions, and the attendance of school superintendents was probably larger than in any previous convention of the Society.

As in the conventions of the past two years, the program was built up around a local industrial, education survey. During the past year three city industrial surveys have been carried out in Indiana. The reports of the surveys conducted in Evansville, Richmond, and Indianapolis, Indiana, were distributed to members of the Society, and several of the sessions were devoted to problems outlined in these investigations.

The passage of the Smith-Hughes law while the convention was in session was the occasion of general rejoicing among the members of the Society, to whom this event marked the attainment of one of the principal objects for which the Society was formed. In fact, the subjects on the program of the convention were relegated to a secondary place because of the interest of members in this bill. Most of the members of the Association are directly interested in the form of organization which must be perfected in the various states to secure the aid for vocational education offered by this law. Several interesting sessions were devoted to discussions of the state legislative and administrative measures which the extension of federal aid under the terms of this act makes necessary.

As to the first step in this program, two forms of legislative enactment were suggested: first, a simple enabling act, and second, a law covering specifically all the principal phases of the administrative organization. In general,

the majority favored the second type of legislation, prescribing very definitely the form of organization and placing the administration of the funds in the hands of special boards, either subordinate to, or independent of, the general state school authorities. The sentiment was practically unanimous that the best results cannot be secured by intrusting the direction of the activities which receive federal aid to the present state school authorities. There was no discussion of the relative merits of unit and dual control, but the consensus of opinion appears to favor placing the administration of vocational education under the charge of special state and local boards.

This *Journal* has on several occasions pointed out the great danger of the enactment of legislation on industrial education before practical experience has made it clear what form of organization is most advantageous. There can be very little question that the participation by the federal government in industrial education is going to bring with it radical changes in state organizations and in the actual conduct of schools of every type. So important a measure as the Smith-Hughes bill ought not to be left for its discussion and for its management to any organization which sees the problem of education from a single point of view. The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education has in times past advocated forms of legislation that have in the course of later experience been radically revised. There can be little doubt that at the present time the disposition of that Society is in favor of a type of organization which distinguishes sharply between industrial education and general education. It is the conviction of the present writer that this separation between the two types of education is harmful to both interests and should, so far as possible, be avoided. No more urgent problem can be presented to the school people of this country than the problem of making general education practical and practical education intellectual in its type.

Several bills have been introduced in the Illinois legislature dealing with the school system of the city of Chicago. One of them has already passed the Senate and one has been before the House Committee for two hearings. It seems altogether probable that legislation of some kind will be enacted at this session.

School Legis-
lation for
Chicago

The Baldwin bill, which has passed the Senate, leaves the system as it is today, except that it provides that the Board of Education

may by a three-quarters majority of its members sell property. At present the sale of property can be completed only with the concurrence of the City Council.

The Mueller bill, which was prepared by Mr. Otis, a member of the School Board, is like the Baldwin bill in its provisions for the sale of property. It goes much farther, however, in changing the present organization. It reduces the board from twenty-one to eleven members and sets up a three-headed executive group consisting of a superintendent, a business manager, and an attorney. These three are to be co-ordinate in rank and answerable only to the board. The superintendent is to have a term of three years and the initiative in recommending teachers, textbooks, and course of study; but it is provided that the board may act in any of these matters by a two-thirds vote without the initiative of the superintendent. The business manager is to have charge of all business affairs and, so far as the bill foresees, there is no problem of initiative or of necessity for taking matters out of the manager's hands. The attorney is in his functions somewhat different from the other executive officers, but may be overruled by a two-thirds vote.

This bill gives the teachers permanency of tenure after a probation of three years.

The bill prepared by a committee of the City Council is very much more radical than either of the others. It creates a new type of board. This board is to be elected by popular vote, the members to be seven in number and to represent the city at large. This board is to be independent of the Council in all matters.

A superintendent is provided who is the central executive officer of the system. He nominates the other officers and the teachers. He has the initiative in matters of business as well as of school organization. The board may contract with him for a term of years or may give him from the first an indefinite tenure.

The board is an independent taxing body subject only to the limitations set up by the state law.

The teachers are given permanent tenure after a probationary period of three years. Their removal for inefficiency is made the exclusive prerogative of the board. An elaborate system of trial is provided before the teacher can be removed in any case. A system

of advisory councils designed to give the teachers a voice in the government of the schools is created.

Besides the bills commented on up to this point, there are measures dealing with pensions and tenure, and there are other bills which affect the system indirectly.

There is evidently a widespread opinion that the present organization of the Chicago system is in need of change. The controversy between the Board and the City Council, between the Board and the teachers, and the uncertainty which has for a generation surrounded the superintendency, which is not at present a statutory office, must in some fashion be removed. There is a further disposition to treat the matter as one to be managed through a series of compromises. The Board evidently feels that in giving the superintendency recognition it is making some kind of concession, and there is evident anxiety lest the superintendency shall become so powerful that one man shall either rule the city or break down in his control. As for the teachers, they are demanding what is called protection, and it seems not unlikely that they will get it in the form of permanency of tenure.

It is unfortunate that these matters should be dealt with in the spirit of compromise. There is a legitimate division of labor between the various authorities in the school system. The superintendent should have powers, not because he can extract them from an unwilling board, but because the city will be best served when the superintendent performs certain functions and the board others. The superintendent should not be held in check because there is a suspicion that he may do something to curtail the authority of the board. There ought to be a clear notion of the functions of these two units within the school organization. There is no need of an overlapping or conflict of functions. The sooner school people realize that it is a part of their duty to define the relations here under discussion, the better it will be for the city and its school system.

As for permanency of tenure for teachers, it should be enacted only when adequate machinery is provided at the same time for the removal of the inefficient. At present the city of Chicago is in no mood to discuss this matter dispassionately. Teachers have been

drastically dismissed, and the teachers have the sympathy of a very large number of people. The city is, however, informed by its School Board that there is much inefficiency which should be eliminated and cannot be properly dealt with except through such drastic action as has been taken. Legislation which goes so far as to give permanency, and which provides no safeguards against the retention of inefficiency, should not be advocated by teachers. The teachers themselves are more interested than any other class of citizens in eliminating inefficiency. There ought to be deliberate and mature consideration of this side of the matter before the city rushes headlong into a crude and ill-considered enactment of permanency of tenure.

It is very frequently assumed that the junior high school is a form of organization which is legitimate only in large school systems. Smaller schools which offer a more limited choice of subjects and have smaller classes are sometimes thought of as unable to enjoy the luxury of a junior high school organization. It is interesting, therefore, to see the following program which has been adopted in Hudson, Ohio, a village of about one thousand inhabitants. This village has a modern school plant costing \$60,000, and has an organization which is exhibited in the following course of study for the junior and senior high schools:

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

FIRST YEAR		SECOND YEAR		THIRD YEAR	
	Periods		Periods		Periods
Arithmetic.....	5	Algebra.....	5	Algebra.....	5
English.....	5	English.....	5	English.....	5
*Physiology	}..... 4	*Agriculture.....	4	General Science...	5
and		American History	}..... 2	Music.....	1
Geography		and		Drawing.....	1
American History..	2	Civil Government		Physical Training..	2
Music.....	1	Music.....	1	ELECT ONE	
Drawing.....	1	Drawing.....	1	Latin.....	5
Physical Training..	2	Physical Training..	2	*Ancient and	}..... 5
ELECT ONE		ELECT ONE		Mediaeval	
Latin.....	5	Latin.....	5	History	
*Manual Training..	10	*Manual Training..	10		
*Domestic Science..	10	*Domestic Science..	10		

NOTE.—The courses in English consist of spelling, writing, composition, grammar, and the classics. Domestic Science, this year, will consist of cooking, household

management, and dry-cleaning. Next year dressmaking and millinery will be offered. General Science is an elementary treatment of the basic principles of biology, physical geography, and physics. Figures to right of each subject represent the number of periods each week. Courses marked * are alternated every two years.

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

FIRST YEAR	SECOND YEAR	THIRD YEAR
English	*English	*American History and Civics
Geometry	*Physics	
Modern History		
ELECT ONE	ELECT TWO	ELECT THREE
Latin	Latin	*English
*Biology	German	German
*Arts and Crafts (Designing)	*Com. Geo. and Com. Law	*Com. Arithmetic
	*English History	*Solid Geometry and Plane Trig.
	*Arts and Crafts (Leather Work)	*Arts and Crafts (Metal Work)

NOTE.—Arts and Crafts is given four periods per week and the three courses count one and one-half units. One period per week of Music is compulsory. Mechanical Drawing and Physical Training are elective in the senior high school.

The state of Connecticut has been making a vigorous effort in recent years to provide school supervision for all its districts.

**School Super-
vision in
Connecticut** Like all the New England systems, the Connecticut system began as a district system with the supervision very commonly in the hands of laymen. Subsidies from the state department were provided, as indicated in the following statement, which has been provided at the request of the editors by Mr. W. S. Dakin, inspector for the state department:

State supervision began in towns having seven to twelve teachers. Half of the supervisor's salary was paid by the state. Now all towns having twenty teachers or less are eligible to receive this assistance, and the entire salary of the supervisor is paid by the state.

At present there are thirty-five of these supervisors, known as agents. They have charge of schools in ninety-seven towns, employing about one thousand teachers, and registering over twenty thousand children.

Emphasis is placed on constructive supervision. Instead of the usual "superintendent," which too frequently suggests bureaucracy and office routine, the title of supervisor is maintained in order that the intimate relation of principal, teacher, pupil, and parent may be ever present.

An important feature is the training of teachers in service through the organization of the regular work so that employment will be educative. It also includes the training of teachers for service through an apprentice system in connection with model schools.

State control of these agents is exercised through: (1) conferences with the state secretary—these are held bimonthly throughout the year; (2) a summer school of two weeks which all supervisors are required to attend; (3) systematic inspection—two men give their entire time to visitation of schools, interviews with supervisors and local committees; (4) circular letters sent from the office of the department at Hartford. These cover such matters as inspection, direction of investigation, collection of information, etc.

Opportunities for individual initiative are provided by standing committees, of which there are some fifteen—committees for high schools, for tests and examinations, for physical training and games, for teachers' meetings, and all important departments of the work. These committees meet at frequent intervals throughout the year. Every agent is on at least one. Those most interested in special subjects are usually appointed chairmen.

The system has been influential in stimulating interest in schools and public education generally. The agents have constituted a mobile force at the disposal of the state for investigation, public meetings, and any emergency demanding prompt action by trained men who are free from local prejudices and independent of small intertown conflicts.

The state department has found it necessary on frequent occasions to go into various districts where this supervision has not been accepted. It is always found under these circumstances that the schools suffer from a lack of proper organization, both of the course of study and of the material conditions under which this course of study is administered.

A copy of the survey made of East Windsor was supplied to this *Journal* by the state department. The following summary taken from that report indicates the type of vigorous comment which the state department finds it necessary to make in dealing with a system that is not supplied with supervision.

**Survey of
East Windsor,
Connecticut**

East Windsor's school population is growing rapidly, but its financial resources are growing much faster. The town's expenditures for schools have not kept pace with either, although the payments for roads have increased faster than for schools.

The town is essentially agricultural, with some manufacturing. Its future lies in the development of its soil, and toward that direction the schools should be pointed.

The administration of the schools has not been progressive, but very conservative. No great amount of interest by the town as a whole can be inferred from the schools' condition. The plant needs concentrating, enlarging,

and repairing. The equipment and apparatus are not sufficient for the proper interpretation of a good course of studies. The course of studies is unsatisfactory from all points of view. The system of recording and reporting is inadequate and inaccurate. The supervision is amateurish and not skilful. It does not co-ordinate the schools nor direct their educational work. It does not conform to the law.

The schools range from very good to very poor. The average is not high. Whether a school is good or poor is wholly determined by the teacher. She is neither helped nor directed by the controlling officers. The progress of the pupils is slow at best, and the amount of actual retardation is great. The discipline in some schools is of the worst type. The instruction is good and poor, and for neither does the system of control provide. The textbooks are good, but are not sufficient in variety. There is little good reading-matter. The registers are not legally kept, nor are the time-tables clear, full, or properly adjusted.

In some parts of the system there is a marked enthusiasm centering about one or two individuals. Indeed, almost all the good work in these schools is due to individuals, and not at all to the system of which they are part. Such systems mean here and there occasionally rapid progress and high quality of work, but for most of the children it means most of the time poor training. Organization should make good schooling the only possible schooling, and should reduce the personal dangers to a minimum. It is democracy to give to each child a training equivalent to the best given other children. A well-organized and carefully manipulated system of control is the only agency which can approach such a standard. Such a system has not been provided by East Windsor.